REMARKS

This response is being filed concurrently with an RCE. Reconsideration of the subject application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 6 and 10 have been amended. New claims 25 and 26 have been added. Support for the new claims can be found at page 5, lines 13-20, for example.

Claims 1, 6, and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Treyz in view of Kushita. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Kushita is cited by the Examiner as teaching "turning power off to a receiving circuit by controller 27 when not receiving time signals in a wireless paging system." Kushita, however, does not teach or suggest the claimed invention. Kushita discloses "[f]or battery saving and signal monitoring purposes, the pager includes a battery saving circuit 27 which *intermittently* supplies the battery voltage to the front end through line 28" (col. 3, lines 39-43). So, as a first point, the battery saving circuit does not *power down* the front end 5, but merely supplies power on an *intermittent* basis.

As a second point, the front end 5 is not a time synchronization client (i.e. 24 in Fig. 2 of the present application) that transmits a query signal for querying a time server. Instead it corresponds to the client hardware device 30 in Fig. 2 of the present application. As discussed in Kushita, the front end 5 is intermittently supplied with the battery voltage. But, the time-keeping circuit 15 is *permanently activated* with power supplied from the battery 24 (col. 3, lines 34-36).

As a third point, Kushita does not elaborate on the "standby mode" (col. 3, line 40 and col. 3, line 48). So, one cannot assume that the events in standby mode occur during "the time during which said time synchronization client is not transmitting said query signal" as specifically recited in Claim 1.

For the reasons set forth above and in prior responses, it is submitted that neither Treyz nor Kushita, alone or in combination, teach or suggest each and every element recited in Claim 1, in the same combination and relation as recited in Claim 1. The remaining claims are dependent on Claim 1 and are patentable for at least the same reasons.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject application is respectfully requested in view of the forgoing amendments and remarks.

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark P. Watson/
Mark P. Watson
Registration No. 31,448

Please address all correspondence to:

Epson Research and Development, Inc.
Intellectual Property Department
2580 Orchard Parkway, Suite 225
San Jose, CA 95131
Phone: (408) 952-6124
Facsimile: (408) 954-9058
Customer No. 20178

Date: June 11, 2008